



(quotation omitted). If a party makes only general objections, de novo review is not required. See Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1997). In “order to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge’s report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection.” Martin v. Duffy, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (quotation omitted); see United States v. Midgette, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007).

The court reviews for clear error. See Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315. The court has reviewed the M&R, the record, and Best’s untimely written objections. There is no clear error on the face of the record. See id. As for Best’s untimely written objections, Best has not established excusable neglect. See, e.g., Smith v. Look Cycle USA, 933 F. Supp. 2d 787, 790 (E.D. Va. 2013) (“Where a party seeks an extension of time after the Rule 6(b) deadline for filing has passed, courts must find excusable neglect before granting the motion.”); cf. Pioneer Inv. Servs. Co. v. Brunswick Assocs. Ltd. P’ship, 507 U.S. 380, 395 (1993) (describing factors to consider concerning excusable neglect). Moreover, and in any event, Best’s objections are baseless.

In sum, the court ADOPTS the conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 8] and DISMISSES WITH PREJUDICE plaintiff’s complaint for failure to state a claim. The clerk shall close the case.

SO ORDERED. This 25 day of March, 2024.

  
JAMES C. DEVER III  
United States District Judge